arXiv:1606.04608v1 [math.CO] 15 Jun 2016

A Degree Condition for a Graph to have (a, b)-Parity Factors *

Haodong Liu and Hongliang Lu†

[a]Department of Mathematics

Xi'an Jiaotong University, Xi'an 710049, PR China

Abstract

Let a, b, n be three positive integers such that $a \equiv b \pmod 2$ and $n \geq b(a+b)(a+b+2)/(2a)$. Let G be a graph of order n with minimum degree at least $a + b/a - 1$. We show that G has an (a, b)-parity factor, if $max\{d_G(u), d_G(v)\} \geq \frac{an}{a+b}$ for any two nonadjacent vertices u, v of G. It is an extension of Nishimura's results for the existence of k-factors (*J. Graph Theory*, **16** (1992), 141–151) and generalizes Li and Cai's result in some senses (*J. Graph Theory*, **27** (1998), 1–6). These conditions are tight.

Keywords: degree condition, parity factor

1 Introduction

In this paper we consider only simple graphs. Let G be a graph with vertex set $V(G)$ and edge set $E(G)$. Given $v \in V(G)$, let $N_G(v)$ denote the set of vertices adjacent to with v in G and $d_G(v) = |N_G(v)|$. The minimum vertex degree in graph G is denoted by $\delta(G)$. We write $N_G[v] = N_G(v) \cup \{v\}$. Given $D \subseteq V(G)$, let $N_D(V) = N_G[v] \cap D$. For $X \subseteq V(G)$, the subgraph of G whose vertex set is X and whose edge set consists of the edges of G joining vertices of X is called the subgraph of G induced by X and is denoted by $G[X]$.

Let g, f be two non-negative integer-valued function such that $g(v) \leq f(v)$ and $g(v) \equiv f(v) \pmod 2$ for all $v \in V(G)$. A spanning subgraph F of G is called (g, f)-*parity factor* if $d_F(v) \equiv f(v) \pmod 2$ and $g(v) \leq d_F(v) \leq f(v)$ for all $v \in V(G)$. A (g, f)-parity factor is called f-*factor* if $f(v) = g(v)$ for all $v \in V(G)$. If $f(v) = k$ for all $v \in V(G)$, then an f-factor is called a k-*factor*. Let a, b be two integers such that $a \leq b$ and $a \equiv b \pmod 2$. If $f(v) = b$ and $g(v) = a$ for all $v \in V(G)$, then a (g, f)-parity factor is called an (a, b)-*parity factor*.

*This work is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 11471257)

†Corresponding email: luhongliang215@sina.com (H. Lu)

Lovász [6] gave a characterization of graphs having (g, f)-parity factors. Amahashi [1] found a Tutte's type characterization for $(1, k)$-odd factors, which was generalized to $(1, f)$-odd factors by Cui and Kano [2].

Theorem 1.1 (Lovász, [6]) *A graph G has a (g, f)-parity factor if and only if for any two disjoint subsets S, T of $V(G)$,*

$$\eta(S,T) = f(S) - g(T) + \sum_{x \in T} d_{G-S}(x) - q(S,T) \geq 0,$$

where $q(S,T)$ denotes the number of components C of $G - S - T$, called g-odd components, such that $g(V(C)) + e_G(V(C), T) \equiv 1 \pmod 2$.

Theorem 1.2 (Amahashi, [1]) *Let $k \geq 1$ be an odd integer. A graph G contains an $(1, k)$-parity factor if and only if for any subset $S \subseteq V(G)$,*

$$c_0(G - S) \leq k|S|,$$

where $c_0(G - S)$ denotes the number of odd components of $G - S$.

Nishimura [3] gave a degree conditions for a graph to have a k-factor.

Theorem 1.3 *Let k be an integer such that $k \geq 3$, and let G be a connected graph of order n with $n \geq 4k - 3$, kn even, and minimum degree at least k. If G satisfies*

$$\max\{d_G(u), d_G(v)\} \geq n/2$$

for each pair of nonadjacent vertices u, v in G, then G has a k-factor.

Li and Cai [4] give a degree conditions for a graph to have an (a, b)-factor, which extended Nishimura's result.

Theorem 1.4 *Let G be a graph of order n, and let a and b be integers such that $1 \leq a < b$. Then G has an [a,b]-factor if $\delta(G) \geq a, n \geq 2a + b + \frac{a^2-a}{b}$ and*

$$\max\{d_G(u), d_G(v)\} \geq \frac{an}{a+b} \tag{1}$$

for any two nonadjacent vertices u and v in G.

In this paper we give a sufficient condition for a graph to have an (a, b)-parity factor in term of the minimum degree of graph G. Our main result generalizes Nishimura's result and improves Li and Cai's result in some sense.

Theorem 1.5 *Let a, b, n be three integers such that $a \equiv b \pmod 2$, na is even and $n \geq b(a+b)(a+b+2)/(2a)$. Let G be a graph of order n. If $\delta(G) \geq a + \frac{b-a}{a}$ and*

$$max\{d_G(u), d_G(v)\} \geq \frac{an}{a+b} \tag{2}$$

for any two nonadjacent vertices, then G has an (a, b)-parity factor.

2 Proof of Theorem 1.5

Firstly, we show that Theorem 1.5 holds for $a = 1$.

Lemma 2.1 *Let k, n be two positive integers such that k is odd, n is even and $n \geq k+1$. Let G be a connected graph with order n. If G satisfies*

$$max\{d_G(u), d_G(v)\} \geq \frac{n}{1+k} \tag{3}$$

for each pair of nonadjacent vertices, then G has a $(1, k)$-odd factor.

Proof. Suppose that G contains no $(1, k)$-parity factors. By Theorem 1.2, there exists a subset $S \subset V(G)$ such that

$$c_o(G - S) > k|S|.$$

Let $C_1, \ldots, C_q$ be these odd components of $G - S$ such that $|C_1| \leq \cdots \leq |C_q|$. Note that n is even and G is connected. By parity, one can see that

$$q = c_o(G - S) \geq k|S| + 2 \text{ and } S \neq \emptyset. \tag{4}$$

Let $u \in V(C_1)$ and $v \in V(C_2)$. By (4), we infer that

$$\begin{aligned}
\max\{d_G(u), d_G(v)\} &\leq \{|C_1| - 1 + |S|, |C_2| - 1 + |S|\} \\
&\leq |C_2| - 1 + |S| \\
&\leq \frac{n - |S| - 1}{q - 1} - 1 + |S| \\
&\leq \frac{n}{k|S| + 1} + |S| - 1 - \frac{1}{k} \quad (\text{since } |S| \geq 1 \text{ and } n \geq (k+1)|S| + 2) \\
&< \frac{n}{k+1},
\end{aligned}$$

contradicts with (3) since $uv \notin E(G)$. □

Proof of Theorem 1.5. By Lemma 2.1, we may assume that $a \geq 2$. By Theorem 1.3, we may assume that $a \leq b-2$. Suppose that G contains no (a,b)-parity factors. By Theorem 1.1, there exists two disjoint vertex sets S and T such that

$$\eta(S,T) = b|S| - a|T| + \sum_{x\in T} d_{G-S}(x) - q(S,T) \leq -2, \tag{5}$$

where $q(S,T)$ denotes the number of components C of $G-S-T$, called a-odd components, such that $g(V(C)) + e_G(V(C),T) \equiv 1 \pmod 2$. We write $s = |S|$, $t = |T|$ and $w = q(S,T)$. From (5), one can see that

$$\eta(S,T) = bs - at + \sum_{x\in T} d_{G-S}(x) - w \leq -2. \tag{6}$$

If $S \cup T = \emptyset$, we have $w \geq 2$ by (1.1), which implies that G consists of at least two components. However, this contradicts the connectedness of G. So we may assume that

$$S \cup T \neq \emptyset. \tag{7}$$

If $w \geq 1$, let $C_1, C_2, \ldots C_w$ denote these a-odd components of $G-S-T$, and $m_i = |V(C_i)|$ for $1 \leq i \leq w$. Put $U = \bigcup_{1\leq i\leq w} V(C_i)$.

We pick S and T such that U is minimal and $V(G) - S - T - U$ is maximal.

Claim 1. $d_{G-S}(u) \geq a+1$ and $e_G(u,T) \leq b-1$ for every vertex $u \in V(U)$.

Firstly, suppose that there exists $u \in U$ such that

$$d_{G-S}(u) \leq a.$$

Let $T' = T \cup \{u\}$. One can see that

$$\begin{aligned}
\eta(S,T') &= bs - a|T'| + \sum_{x\in T'} d_{G-S}(x) - q(S,T') \\
&= bs - at - a + \sum_{x\in T} d_{G-S}(x) + d_{G-S}(u) - q(S,T') \\
&\leq bs - at + \sum_{x\in T} d_{G-S}(x) - (q(S,T) - 1) \\
&\leq -1,
\end{aligned}$$

which implies by parity

$$\eta(S,T') = bs - a|T'| + \sum_{x\in T'} d_{G-S}(x) - q(S,T') \leq -2,$$

contradicting the minimality of U. Secondly, suppose that there exists $u \in U$ such that

$$e_G(u,T) \geq b.$$

Let $S' = S \cup \{u\}$. One can see that

$$\begin{aligned}\eta(S',T) &= b|S'| - at + \sum_{x\in T} d_{G-S'}(x) - q(S',T)\\ &= bs + b - at + \sum_{x\in T} d_{G-S}(x) - e_G(u,T) - q(S',T)\\ &\leq bs - at + \sum_{x\in T} d_{G-S}(x) - (q(S,T)-1)\\ &\leq -1,\end{aligned}$$

which implies by parity

$$\eta(S',T) = b|S'| - at + \sum_{x\in T} d_{G-S'}(x) - q(S',T) \leq -2,$$

contradicting the minimality of U again. This completes Claim 1. □

Claim 2. Let $C_{i_1},\ldots,C_{i_\tau}$ be any τ components of $G[U]$ and let $U' = \bigcup_{j=1}^{\tau} V(C_{i_j})$. $d_{G[T\cup U']}(u) \leq a - 1 + \tau$ for every vertex $u \in T$.

Suppose that there exists $u \in T$ such that $d_{G[T\cup U']}(u) \geq a + \tau$. Let $T' = T - u$. One may see that

$$\begin{aligned}\eta(S,T') &= bs - a|T'| + \sum_{x\in T'} d_{G-S}(x) - q(S,T')\\ &= bs - at + a + \sum_{x\in T} d_{G-S}(x) - d_{G-S}(u) - q(S,T')\\ &\leq bs - at + a + \sum_{x\in T} d_{G-S}(x) - (a+\tau) - (q(S,T)-\tau)\\ &= bs - at + \sum_{x\in T} d_{G-S}(x) - q(S,T) \leq -2,\end{aligned}$$

contradicting to the maximality of $V(G) - S - T - U$. This completes Claim 2. □

From the definition of U, we have

$$|U| \geq m_1 + m_2(w-1). \tag{8}$$

By Claim 1, one can see that for every $u \in C_j$ $(1 \leq j \leq w)$,

$$d_G(u) \leq (m_j - 1) + s + r \tag{9}$$

where $r = \min\{b, t\}$. Let $u_1 \in V(C_1)$ and $u_2 \in V(C_2)$. It follow from (9) that

$$\max\{d_G(u_1), d_G(u_2)\} \leq (m_2 - 1) + s + r \tag{10}$$

Claim 3. $S \neq \emptyset$.

Suppose that $S = \emptyset$. By (7), one may see that $t \geq 1$. Note that $\delta(G) \geq a + \frac{b-a}{a}$. So we have $d_G(x_1) \geq a + \frac{b-a}{a}$. From Theorem (1.1), one can see that

$$w = q(S, T) \geq \sum_{v \in T} d_G(v) - at + 2 \geq \frac{b-a}{a}t + 2. \tag{11}$$

If $w > \frac{b}{a} + 2$, since $b \geq a + 2$, then it follows that

$$w \geq \frac{b+2}{a} + 2. \tag{12}$$

Combining (10) and (12), one can see that

$$\max\{d_G(u_1), d_G(u_2)\} \leq m_2 - 1 + s + r \leq \frac{n-t-1}{w-1} + b < \frac{an}{a+b+2} + b < \frac{an}{a+b},$$

contradicting to (1). So we may assume that $w \leq \frac{b}{a} + 2$. From (11), we infer that

$$\frac{b-a}{a}t + 2 \leq \frac{b}{a} + 2,$$

i.e.,

$$t \leq \frac{b}{b-a}. \tag{13}$$

From (11), we have

$$m_1 \leq \frac{a(n-t)}{a+b}.$$

Consider $H = G[V(C_1) \cup T]$. By Claim 2, for every $y \in T$, one can see that

$$d_G(y) \leq a - 1 + w \leq \frac{b}{a} + 1 + a < \frac{an}{a+b}.$$

By Claims 1 and 2, $d_{G-S}(u) = d_H(u) \geq a + 1$ for every $u \in V(C_1)$ and $d_H(v) \leq a$ for every $v \in T$. Thus there exists two non-adjacent vertices $u \in V(C_1)$ and $v \in T$. If $m_1 \leq \frac{an}{a+b} - \frac{b}{b-a}$, then one can see that

$$\max\{d_G(u), d_G(v)\} \leq m_1 - 1 + t < \frac{an}{a+b},$$

a contradiction. Thus we may assume that $m_1 \geq \frac{an}{a+b} - \frac{b}{b-a}$. We claim that there exists $u \in V(C_1)$ such that $e_G(u,T) = 0$, otherwise, by Claim 2 and (13), we have

$$\frac{ab}{b-a} \geq at \geq \sum_{x \in T} d_{G[V(C_1) \cup T]}(x) \geq m_1 \geq \frac{an}{a+b} - \frac{b}{b-a},$$

i.e.,

$$n \leq \frac{(a+1)b(a+b)}{a(b-a)},$$

a contradiction. It follows

$$\max\{d_G(u), d_G(v)\} \leq m) \leq m_1 - 1 + s = m_1 - 1 < \frac{an}{b+a},$$

a contradiction. This completes Claim 3. □

Claim 4. $T \neq \emptyset$.

Suppose that $T = \emptyset$. By Theorem 1.1, then we have

$$w \geq bs + 2.$$

By Claim 1, we have $|V(C_i)| \geq a + 1$ for $1 \leq i \leq w$. Thus we infer that

$$n \geq (a+1)w + s \geq (a+1)(bs+2) + s > (a+1)bs,$$

which implies that

$$s \leq \frac{n}{(a+1)b}.$$

Hence we have

$$m_2 - 1 + s \leq \frac{n-s}{w-1} + s \leq \frac{n}{bs+1} + s < \frac{an}{a+b},$$

a contradiction. This completes Claim 4. □

Put $h_1 := \min\{d_{G-S}(v) \mid v \in T\}$, and let $x_1 \in T$ be a vertex satisfying $d_{G-S}(x_1) = h_1$. We write $p = |N_T[x_1]|$. Further, if $T - N_T[x_1] \neq \emptyset$, let $h_2 := \min\{d_{G-S}(v) \mid v \in T - N_T[x_1]\}$ and let $x_2 \in T - N_T[x_1]$ such that $d_{G-S}(x_2) = h_2$. By the definition of x_i, we have

$$\max\{d_G(x_1), d_G(x_2)\} \leq \max\{h_1 + s, h_2 + s\} \leq h_2 + s. \tag{14}$$

Now we discuss four cases.

Case 1. $h_1 \geq a$.

By Theorem 1.1, one can see that

$$\begin{aligned} w &\geq bs - at + \sum_{v \in T} d_{G-S}(v) + 2 \\ &\geq bs + (h_1 - a)t + 2 \\ &\geq bs + 2, \end{aligned}$$

i.e.,

$$w \geq bs + 2. \tag{15}$$

Note that $n \geq w + s + t$. From (15), we infer that

$$s < \frac{n}{b+1}.$$

Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} m_2 - 1 + s + r &\leq \frac{n-t}{bs+1} + s + b \\ &\leq \frac{n}{bs+1} + s + b - 1 \\ &< \frac{an}{a+b}, \end{aligned}$$

a contradiction.

So we may assume that $h_1 < a$.

Case 2. $T = N_T[x_1]$.

We write $t = |N_T[x_1]|$. Since $h_1 < a$, we have $t \leq a$. By Claim 1, one can see that for every $u \in V(C_1)$, $d_{G-S}(u) \geq a+1 > h_1$. Thus we infer that $V(C_1) - N_G(x_1) \neq \emptyset$, i.e., there exists a vertex $v \in V(C_1)$ such that $x_1 v \notin E(G)$. By Theorem 1.1,

$$\begin{aligned} w &\geq bs + (h_1 - a)t + 2 \\ &\geq bs + (h_1 - a)(h_1 + 1) + 2 \\ &\geq b(a + \frac{b}{a} - 1 - h_1) + (h_1 - a)(h_1 + 1) + 2 \quad (\text{since } s + h_1 \geq \delta(G) \geq a + \tfrac{b}{a} - 1) \\ &= h_1^2 - (a + b - 1)h_1 + ab + \frac{b^2}{a} - a - b + 2 \quad (\text{since } 1 \leq h_1 \leq a \text{ and } a < b) \\ &\geq \frac{b^2}{a} - b + 2 > 0, \end{aligned}$$

i.e.,

$$w \geq bs + (h_1 - a)(h_1 + 1) + 2 > 2. \tag{16}$$

One can see that

$$\begin{aligned}\max\{d_G(v), d_G(x_1)\} &\leq m_1 + s + t - 1\\ &\leq \frac{n-s-t}{w} + s + t - 1\\ &\leq \frac{n-s-t}{bs + (h_1 - a)(h_1+1) + 2} + s + t - 1\\ &\leq \frac{n-s-h_1-1}{bs + (h_1 - a)(h_1+1) + 2} + s + h_1\\ &= \frac{n - h_1 - 1 + \frac{1}{b}(h_1 - a)(h_1+1)}{bs + (h_1 - a)(h_1+1) + 2} - \frac{1}{b} + s + h_1,\end{aligned}$$

i.e.,

$$\max\{d_G(v), d_G(x_1)\} \leq \frac{n - h_1 - 1 + \frac{1}{b}(h_1 - a)(h_1+1)}{bs + (h_1 - a)(h_1+1) + 2} - \frac{1}{b} + s + h_1.$$

We write

$$f(s) = \frac{n - h_1 - 1 + \frac{1}{b}(h_1 - a)(h_1+1)}{bs + (h_1 - a)(h_1+1) + 2} - \frac{1}{b} + s + h_1. \tag{17}$$

So we have

$$f'(s) = -\frac{b(n - h_1 - 1) + (h_1 - a)(h_1+1)}{(bs + (h_1 - a)(h_1+1) + 2)^2} + 1. \tag{18}$$

Now we discuss two subcases.

Case 2.1. $s \leq \frac{an}{a+b} - h_1 - 1$.

By (16) and (18), we infer that

$$f(s) \leq \max\{f(a + \frac{b}{a} - h_1 - 1), f(\frac{an}{a+b} - h_1 - 1)\}. \tag{19}$$

Hence one can see that

$$\begin{aligned}max\{d_G(x_1), d_G(x_2)\} &\leq m_1 - 1 + s + t\\ &\leq \max\{f(a + \frac{b}{a} - h_1 - 1), f(\frac{an}{a+b} - h_1 - 1)\}\\ &< \frac{an}{a+b},\end{aligned}$$

contradicting to the degree condition.

Case 2.2. $s > \frac{an}{a+b} - h_1 - 1$.

One can see that

$$\begin{aligned} n &\geq s+t+w \\ &\geq s+t+bs+(h_1-a)t+2 \\ &\geq (b+1)\frac{an}{a+b}-(b+1)h_1-(b+1)+(h_1-a)(h_1+1)+2 \\ &= (b+1)\frac{an}{a+b}+h_1^2-(a+b)h_1-a-b+1 \quad (\text{since } 0\leq h_1\leq a) \\ &\geq \frac{abn}{a+b}+\frac{an}{a+b}-ab-a-b+1>n \quad (\text{since } a\geq 2), \end{aligned}$$

a contradiction.

Case 3. $h_2 \geq a$.

By Lovász Theorem 1.1,

$$\begin{aligned} w &\geq bs+\sum_{v\in T} d_{G-S}(v)-at+2 \\ &\geq bs+(h_1-a)p+(h_2-p)(t-p)+2 \\ &\geq bs+(h_1-a)p+2 \end{aligned}$$

Now we discuss two subcases.

Subcase 3.1. $h_2 \leq \frac{1}{4}(a^2+6a+5)$.

By Lovász Theorem 1.1, we find

$$s \geq \frac{an}{a+b}-h_2 \geq \frac{an}{a+b}-\frac{1}{4}(a^2+6a+5).$$

Hence one can see that

$$\begin{aligned} n &\geq w+s+t \\ &\geq (b+1)s+(h_1-a)p+2+t \\ &\geq (b+1)s+(h_1-a+1)p+2 \\ &\geq (b+1)(\frac{an}{a+b}-\frac{1}{4}(a^2+6a+5)+1)+(h_1-a+1)(h_1+1)+2 \\ &> n, \end{aligned}$$

a contradiction.

Subcase 3.2. $h_2 \geq \frac{1}{4}(a^2+6a+5)$.

By Lovász Theorem 1.1,

$$\begin{aligned} w &\geq bs + \sum_{v\in T} d_{G-S}(v) - at + 2 \\ &\geq bs + (h_1 - a)p + (h_2 - a)(t - p) + 2 \\ &\geq bs + (h_1 - a)(h_1 + 1) + h_2 - a + 2 \\ &\geq bs - \frac{1}{4}(a+1)^2 + h_2 - a + 2 \\ &\geq bs + 3. \end{aligned}$$

We find

$$n \geq s + t + w \geq (b+1)s + 2,$$

which implies that

$$s \leq \frac{n-2}{b+1}.$$

Thus by Claim 1, we infer that

$$\begin{aligned} m_2 - 1 + s + b &\leq \frac{n-s-t}{bs+2} + s + b - 1 \\ &\leq \frac{n-s}{bs+2} + s + b - 1 \\ &< \frac{n-2}{bs+1} + s + b \\ &< \frac{an}{a+b}, \end{aligned}$$

a contradiction.

Case 4. $0 \leq h_1 \leq h_2 \leq a-1$.

By (1), we infer that

$$s \geq \frac{an}{a+b} - h_2. \tag{20}$$

By Lovasz Theorem 1.1,

$$\begin{aligned} w &\geq bs + \sum_{v\in T} d_{G-S}(v) - at + 2 \\ &\geq bs + (h_1 - a)p + (h_2 - a)(t - p) + 2, \end{aligned}$$

where $p = |N_T[x_1]|$ and naturally there is $p \leq a$,

$$w \geq bs + (h_1 - a)p + (h_2 - a)(t - p) + 2. \tag{21}$$

Thus we get

$$\begin{aligned}
n &\geq s+t+w \\
&\geq (b+1)s+(h_1-a)p+(h_2-a)(t-p)+2+t \\
&= (b+1)s+(h_1-h_2)p+(h_2+1-a)t+2 \\
&\geq (b+1)(\frac{an}{a+b}-h_2)+(h_1-h_2)(h_1+1)+(h_2-a+1)(\frac{bn}{a+b}+h_2)+2 \\
&\geq (b+1)\frac{an}{a+b}+(-a+1)(\frac{bn}{a+b}+h_2)+2+h_2(\frac{bn}{a+b}+h_2-b-1)+(h_1-h_2)(h_1+1) \\
&\geq n+2,
\end{aligned}$$

a contradiction. This completes the proof. □

Remark : These minimum degree conditions are sharp. Let a, b, m be three integers, such that m is sufficiently large. Consider graph $K_{ma,mb+1}$. Denote $K_{ma,mb+1}$ by G. Li and Cai [4] show that $K_{ma,mb+1}$ contains no $[a,b]$-factors. One can see that

$$\frac{an}{a+b} > \delta(G) \geq ma > \frac{a|V(G)|}{a+b} - 1.$$

Other hand. Let $C_1, \ldots, C_q$ be q copies of K_m, where $q = a + \lceil \frac{b-a}{a} \rceil - 1$. Let G' be a graph obtained form $C_1, \ldots, C_q$ by adding a new vertex v connecting one of vertices of each copy. Clearly, G' is connected and $\delta(G') = a + \lceil \frac{b-a}{a} \rceil - 1$. By taking $S = \emptyset$ and $T = \{v\}$, we infer that G' contains no (a,b)-parity factor by Lovasz's Theorem 1.1.

References

[1] A. Amahashi, On factors with all degree odd, *Graph and Combin.,* **1** (1985), 111–114.

[2] Y. Cui and M. Kano, Some results on odd factors of graphs, *J. Graph Theory,* **12** (1988), 327–333.

[3] T. Nishimura, A degree condition for the existence of k-factors. *J. Graph Theory,* **16** (1992), 141–151.

[4] Y. Li and M. Cai, A degree condition for a graph to have $[a,b]$-factors, J. Graph Theory, **27** (1998), 1–6.

[5] L. Lovász, Subgraphs with prescribed valencies, J. Combin. Theory, **8** (1970), 391–416.

[6] L. Lovász, The factorization of graphs. II, *Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar.*, **23** (1972),223–246.

[7] W. Tutte, The factors of graphs, *Canad. J. Math*, **4** (1952), 314-328.